

Puget Sound Partnership Ecosystem Coordination Board  
Meeting Summary

August 22, 2008  
Shelton Yacht Club, Shelton, WA

---

Strait of Juan de Fuca	Steve	Tharinger
Whidbey Island	Gary	Rowe
Hood Canal	Teri	King
South Central Puget Sound	Ron	Sims
North Central Puget Sound	Steve	Bauer
South Puget Sound	Dan	Wrye
Business Interest	Sam	Anderson
Small Business	Bill	Dewey
Environmental Interest	Kathy	Fletcher
Environmental Interest	Jacques	White
Cities	Jeanne	Burbidge
Ports	John	Calhoun
Tribal Government	Randy	Kinley
Tribal Government	Dave	Herrera
Legislative caucus	Christine	Rolfes
Legislative caucus	Phil	Rockefeller
Federal Government	Barry	Thom
Federal Government	Ken	Berg
Federal Government	Michael	Rylko
Washington State Agencies	Jay	Manning
	Josh	Baldi (portion of day)
Washington State Agencies	Joe	Stohr
Washington State Agencies	Doug	Sutherland
	Fran	McNair (portion of day)

LC Members Present:

- Bill Wilkerson

Staff:

- David Dicks, Executive Director
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Jim Cahill, Budget and Accountability Director
- Paul Bergman, Communications Director
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Bill Ross, Facilitator
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Ecosystem Coordination Board
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant to the Tribes

---

*It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting.  
A full recording of this meeting is retained by PSP as the formal record.*

---

Action Items:

- Approval of July 18, 2008, Meeting Summary

**Meeting Summary:**

- Action Agenda Development – update and solicit Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) feedback
- Funding Strategy - update and solicit ECB feedback
- Science – update and solicit ECB feedback
- General Council Business

**10:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER – Ron Sims, Chair**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Chair Sims reviewed the agenda and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF JULY MEETING SUMMARY**

John Calhoun **MOVED** to approve the July 18, 2008, meeting summary. Jeanne Burbridge **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** the meeting summary as presented.

**ACTION AREA HOST WELCOME**

Dan Wrye welcomed the group giving a brief overview of the South Puget Sound Action Area and meeting facility.

**AGENCY PROGRESS REPORT**

David Dicks thanked Dan for hosting this meeting.

David Dicks provided an overview of staff work since the last meeting:

- In addition to the Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board, and Science Panel meetings there have been at least 27 other public meeting including two rounds of Action Area meetings and the Topic Forum meetings since work began on the Action Agenda less than a year ago
- Topic Forum papers are currently being peer reviewed under the direction of the Science Panel
- Working to populate the Action Agenda with information – Martha Neuman will provide more detail during her time on the agenda
- David reviewed the schedule for the Action Agenda
- Full draft of the Action Agenda will be released for public review in October
- December 1 will have the final approval with presentation to the Legislature in January

**ACTION AGENDA – Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director (See meeting materials for details.)**

*Action Agenda Outline*

Martha reviewed the latest draft version of the Action Agenda outline explaining which pieces are being used under each of the four questions:

- What is the current status of Puget Sound's health and what are the biggest threats to it?
- What is a healthy Puget Sound?
- What actions should be taken that will move us from where we are today to a healthy Puget Sound by 2020?
- Where do we start?

Martha reviewed what information will be used to answer the four questions.

The current health question will be answered by synthesizing information from:

- Threats and Drivers Report,
- Topic Forum Papers, and
- Action Area profiles

What is a healthy Puget Sound will use:

- Six goals from legislation
- Science-based features (resilient, representative, results)
- World Resource Institute interviews of good and services
- Indicators and benchmarks

What do we need to do will use:

- Principles of scientific management
- 4 strategic priorities (see handout)

Martha provided a diagram to outline the where do we start question and includes:

- Strategic priorities
- Partnership initiatives
- Action areas priorities and needs
  - Some of the priorities may rise up to the regional level

The Board talked about whether the Partnership will focus on more intact areas of the ecosystem. The Partnership will be looking at a variety of issues Soundwide, as all parts of the Puget Sound play a role in ecosystem health and prioritize actions to focus on in the near term.

Martha reported that the Action Area Profiles have become fairly popular to use as a communication tool in the Action Areas. The plan is to make the profiles a little more robust so they are better communication tools.

The Board discussed the Partnership initiatives concept and how to get to a final list of actions to take in this first Action Agenda. Not sure how many actions will end up being put forward but each will be concretely articulated on how and why they will be done not just a wish list.

They then discussed how to lay out the requests and the need for accountability and need to have as much specificity as possible to be accountable. We will need to identify the "who", "what", and the "when" which will be very difficult in this first round but it is necessary. There is a lot going on now and many actions need to continue moving forward but will also need to focus on what needs to happen to save the Sound. Actions will include legislative reform, process changes, capital projects, and other actions.

Some items will be identified that need to stop, some are great and need to continue, others need to be modified for one reason or another, and then some information will be missing or a gap identified that need to be added to the Action Agenda.

The group discussed how the Science Panel fits in and that the Strategic Science Plan will help with laying out the projects needed. Scientists are not the policy makers but they will be providing their best knowledge on what the best projects are to restore the Sound.

The Board members hope there will be bold actions presented to move forward and that these actions will be the best way to spend money that will be the best for the Sound.

*Integration of Ecosystem Services Research into Action Planning*

The ECB received a presentation by Charles Iceland and Craig Hanson of the World Resources Institute.

Ecosystem Services include three categories: provisioning, regulating, and cultural services.

Interviews were held from mid-May through early July 2008.

The project goal was to identify "most important" ecosystem goods and services provided by Puget Sound in order to help Partnership to:

1. Define what a "healthy Sound" is
2. Prioritize indicators for measuring and monitoring the status of the Sound
3. Communicate the goals of the Partnership

From the interviews they identified two tiers of the "most important" ecosystem services across sectors:

**Tier I**

- Water
- Water regulation
- Recreation and ecotourism
- Ethical and existence values

**Tier II**

- Capture fisheries
- Aquaculture
- Water purification and waste treatment

The definitions and types of benefits were explained for each of the services on the list.

ECB Question: How would you recommend using the priority services in the selection of actions?

- Concern with polling being done across the Sound where we may find different results when talking to a specific Action Area
- Would be concerned with choosing projects through this process
- May be useful as a broad screening tool

- Would like to have Leadership Council be interviewed to see what results come from them
- Good tool and framework for looking at the Action Agenda but missing some of the ethics or intrinsic value so missing some of the basics

### **OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Dennis McDonald, Regional Project Manager, City of Shelton*, discussed the need for an upgrade to Shelton's water and septic infrastructure and how much this effort will cost.

### **FUNDING OPTIONS AND STRATEGIES**

David Dicks introduced this agenda item providing an overview of past actions and vision for future actions. The timing is off this year but as the process goes on the actions will get in soon get into sync.

Jim Cahill and Dennis Canty presented this agenda item. (See meeting materials for details.)

The goal is to figure out the highest priorities are for spending money on and how to find new fund sources to get the money needed to get the work done.

Jim provided an update on the process and what needs to be done before October. Decisions that need to be made are:

1. How do we align existing activities around the Action Agenda?
2. How can we increase benefits from how we are currently spending money; and identify new revenue sources for Puget Sound restoration projects?

All of the budget work needs to be done prior to having the Actions selected, making the process more difficult.

The focus is on ways to increase the benefits of current spending, encourage voluntary conservation actions, and initiate new fund sources.

The Board discussed additional options and ways to develop the best funding strategy and the need to be spending money more wisely while saving the Sound.

Possible first steps:

- Create the fee-in-lieu and seek initial projects
- Invest appropriations in some project w/ potential for procuring market credits
- Begin to set up the market infrastructure
- Pursue legislative authority for a regional district

Discussed Mitigation for wetlands and how this has not been as successful as we would like, only about 50% success. Would like no net loss and get to positive results.

ECB Question: What funding strategies appear to be the most useful for successful implementation of the Action Agenda?

- Good summary with several new tools being proposed
- Need auditing system to make sure we are doing what we say we are going to do
- Some things can be legal but may not be the best things to do – want to see progress
- Need more ideas on the recreation side for revenue
- Assumptions on timing – biggest issue confronting the Partnership is if the Action Agenda is on the fast track and funding is put off – huge issue to put this off

Jim provided a spreadsheet listing new and conventional funding sources asking for ECB feedback on this list.

ECB members felt it would be useful to have the list arranged in some order (amounts of money, etc) to compare and be able to take the discussion a step further to the opinions folks might have on these. Although the list has many ideas with substantial pros and cons, several Board members didn't feel they were set up to have a meaningful conversation during this meeting.

Bill Ross agrees with the comment on need to have the information organized to be able to provide the Leadership Council with feedback. Asked when this will go to the Leadership Council.

David Dicks discussed how the Financing Group is at a substantive disadvantage since we don't have the "what" yet. Staff can rearrange the chart into some order and discuss at the October 1 ECB meeting. The ECB will be meeting again before the next Leadership Council meeting so there will be an opportunity for the ECB to provide the Leadership Council with feedback. The next Leadership Council meeting will be October 22 and 23.

Several Board members stressed the need to figure out how to make restoring Puget Sound "fun." David Dicks believes it will be fun, innovative, and exciting trying to figure out what we are going to do to restore Puget Sound.

There will be a focused discussion of this agenda item during the October 1 ECB meeting.

## **SCIENCE**

Scott Redman and Timothy Quinn presented this agenda item. (See meeting materials for details.)

### *Indicators – The Science and Policy Link*

Scott explained what the indicators are and how these will be used to show progress.

The Science Panel is identifying existing indicators that the Leadership Council can use in the first Action Agenda and that the Science Panel is aware that this is not all the indicators and that some gaps will need to be filled.

The indicators have gone through a technical review and are now in the policy link for making decisions on what the final list of indicators should be.

Scott reviewed the list of indicators the Science Panel has made preliminary approval of.

Tim explained this is Phase 1 of the indicator analysis; Phase 2 will be a more thorough analysis of the information, gaps and costs associated.

ECB Question: How do these indicators resonate for tracking and communicating progress?

ECB members were still not sure how this all fits together and where the benchmarks come in. Scott explained that the benchmarks have not been presented yet and staff are working on them for discussion during the October ECB meeting.

Scott informed the Board that two tables are missing: Biodiversity/Food Web and Human Well-being and that there are teams working on both these sets of indicators. A subcommittee meeting is scheduled to go over the remaining indicators lists.

Tim explained that the list came from existing work and if something is missing from the list, it may be because we don't have the existing processes for that indicator yet or it may be under a different category. He explained that some indicators need to be at the global scale, such as temperature and acidity, which are one result of global warming.

Additional information on this agenda item will be presented at the October 1 meeting.

## **PUBLIC OPINION POLL RESULTS**

Paul Bergman presented this agenda item. (See meeting materials for details.)

### **Key activities:**

- Lots of outreach around Action areas
- A public outreach campaign is scheduled to start in mid-November
- Once Action Agenda is done, communication will move to implementation of the Action Agenda
- Implementing communication plan will be build excitement around the Action Agenda
- Today talking about results of opinion poll

Paul explained how the polling was used and how different ways of saying the same thing brings the same results. Plan to do a poll every six months although generally people agree that clean up needs to happen.

- Public generally think the health of Puget Sound is pretty good.
- The public understands the land water connection and everyone is responsible for the problem in this area more than in other parts of the country
- Threats are spread across the board not a top three which is what shows up in other parts of the country

### **Next steps:**

Developing messaging

Producing creative: TV, radio, Internet, print

Two phases:

November 08 – January 09

May 09-July 09

Staff will be coordinating with Partners and Foundation to augment the efforts.

Use of personal stories was suggested and Paul reported that is part of the plan to include a local focus. The goal of this effort is to raise the awareness and understanding that there is a problem that needs to be worked on. The campaign will start by highlighting existing threats and then start working on focusing on solutions. Will be finding ways to empower people, not cause fear – there is a fear fatigue.

Chair Sims noted the number of items needing to be on the October 1 agenda and let Board members know that the meeting will need to start early and go until 5:00 p.m. This will be a full day meeting.

**3:08 p.m.      ADJOURN**

Ecosystem Coordination Board Approval

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Sims, Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Next Meeting:      October 1, 2008  
Jamestown S'Klallam Conference Center  
Sequim, Washington